

# The Sun

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1905.

Entered at the Post Office at New York, as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.  
 DAILY, Per Month, \$1.00  
 DAILY, Per Year, \$10.00  
 SUNDAY, Per Year, \$2.00  
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$12.00  
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$1.00  
 Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

If our readers who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

## What Does the Treaty Mean by the Word "Government"?

We call attention to the possible need of amendment in the wording of the Santo Domingo treaty, in case the general principle of that proposed contract is approved by the Senate.

Apart from the main question of reciprocity and financial administration, the important provisions concerning American duties and responsibilities in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic are contained in Article VII.

"The Government of the United States, at the request of the Dominican Republic, shall grant the latter such other assistance as the former may deem proper to restore the credit, preserve the order, increase the efficiency of the civil administration, and advance the material progress and welfare of the Dominican Republic."

The corresponding article in the Dillingham-Sanchez agreement, which was not intended to go to the Senate for ratification or revision is this:

"The American Government, at the request of the Dominican Republic, shall grant such other assistance as may be in its power to restore the credit, preserve the order, increase the efficiency of the civil administration and advance the material progress and the welfare of the Republic."

The wide difference is apparent by comparison. The abandoned agreement was mandatory; the new protocol is permissive. The word "may" has replaced the word "shall." By the Dillingham-Sanchez agreement the "American Government" bound itself to do police work and other civilizing work in Santo Domingo when the Dominican Republic so requested. It bound itself to render "such other assistance as may be in its power," and the power of this nation is certainly not inconsiderable. By the pending treaty "the Government of the United States" undertakes to grant only such assistance of this sort as it, the Government of the United States, "may deem proper."

The change from the original proposal is salutary, but further modification, or perhaps we should say more exact definition, is plainly required.

Who or what is the "Government" which is to decide as to the propriety of American interference in the internal affairs of Santo Domingo at the request of the Dominican authorities? Does the word "Government," as here employed, mean the Executive alone and at his own discretion, or does it mean the Executive acting by authority of a law of the Congress?

There can be no doubt that in the original Dillingham-Sanchez agreement the words "American Government" meant the President alone, inasmuch as the legislative department of our Government was wholly ignored by that instrument. In another part of the pending treaty this singular confusion of a part with the whole has been corrected verbally. It will be observed that Article VI. of the Dillingham-Sanchez agreement conferred on "the American Government" the power to veto any tariff legislation by the Dominican Legislature which might impair the revenues yielded by the custom houses. That meant, of course, the American Executive, acting absolutely alone; and in the corresponding article of the new treaty there is a change which locates exactly the veto power over Dominican tariff legislation. The present treaty locates this power, not in "the American Government," but in "the President of the United States." The change leaves no room for a doubtful or contested interpretation of the provision hereafter.

It is strange that Article VII., conferring powers vastly greater and more susceptible of dangerous application than the veto of objectionable tariff laws affecting the Dominican customs, should not have been revised with equal care on our Department of State. In Article VII. the words "American Government" are replaced in the new protocol by the words "the Government of the United States"—a change which adds nothing in the way of explicitness. If "American Government" can be interpreted to mean the President only, so also can "the Government of the United States" be interpreted under the stress of future events to mean the President acting without specific authority from Congress.

The Senate should scrutinize carefully the wording of Article VII. This is much more than a question of nicety of phrase. The power to enter foreign territory at the request of a foreign Government and to "preserve order" there to any extent deemed proper by the invader, if now established by treaty as the supreme law of the land, is sure to become in time the precedent for similar relations with other southern republics than Santo Domingo. The precedent and power in the hands of an American Executive more restless, more rash, more impulsive and more impatient of the restraints of regularly enacted law than President Roosevelt is might be the instruments of incalculable evil.

Therefore, let the Senate amend the text of Article VII. of this treaty so to make it clear that the policing of foreign territory in Santo Domingo or elsewhere, the supplementing of civil administration in Santo Domingo or elsewhere and the "advancement of the material progress and welfare of the Dominican Republic" or other republics, when undertaken by "the Government of the United States" must be really an act of the Government of the United States, in the form of law, and not merely the enterprise of an Executive proceeding independently of the coordinate department of the Government—that is, of Congress.

## What Fate for McCall?

When Col. WILLIAM J. BRYAN engaged an assistant to relieve him of a part of the labor involved in the production of his weekly newspaper he announced that it was his intention to devote more of his attention to political matters in the future than he had in the past. The governmental reforms advocated by Col. BRYAN had reached a stage of progress at which he deemed it necessary to give to them his personal attention. The preliminary steps he had been willing to leave in the hands of others. The final acts he felt must be directed by no one but himself.

The first result of Col. BRYAN'S increased political activity is published to the world this week. He has decided on the punishment to be inflicted on the five traitors who declined to vote in the House of Representatives in favor of his bill for the Federal regulation of railway rates. The victims of his avenging hand are the Hon. TOWNSEND SCUDDER of the First New York district, the Hon. FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON of the Thirteenth New York district, the Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN of the Eighteenth New York district, the Hon. ALLAN LANGDON McDERMOTT of the Tenth New Jersey district, and the Hon. JOSEPH H. SHULL of the Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania district.

These treasonable Democrats dared to oppose a high and holy project upon which Col. BRYAN'S heart was set. They had no right to expect clemency or hope for pity. But Col. BRYAN is as merciful as he is mighty. He exercises his power with magnanimity. He is satisfied to deprive the culprits of their political life, but spares their heads. His sentence:

"Six Democrats voted against the rate bill, and by so doing forfeited any claim that they might have previously had to Democratic respect or support. A Democrat who will refuse to vote for a railroad regulation bill which even a majority of the Republicans were constrained to support may find some excuse for calling himself a Democrat, but Democrats can surely find no excuse for calling him to legislative service while there is likelihood of a conflict between the people and the corporations."

This is the fate of the disobedient members of the great and powerful Bryan party. It is harsh, but it is just. But what is to be done with the arch-conspirator, McCall? His offence is blacker than theirs. They merely voted against Col. BRYAN'S plan. Mr. McCall made it ridiculous.

## The British Ministry Still Stands.

If the debate and subsequent decision which took place on Thursday in the House of Commons be carefully examined, it will be recognized that the Balfour Government, though nominally it received a vote of confidence, exists solely by the tolerance of the Chamberlains on the one hand and the Conservative Free Traders on the other. An analysis of the vote on the Asquith amendment to the address responsive to the King's speech shows that had it been supported by either Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN or by Lord HERTFORD, it must have been carried and a dissolution of Parliament must have ensued.

When Mr. CHAMBERLAIN rose to speak in the afternoon the House of Commons was wrought to a high pitch of tension, for it was known that a majority of the Ministerialists regard the member from West Birmingham as their real leader. In view of his own repeated professions of eagerness to face the electors, how could he contradict the avowed embodiment in the Asquith amendment that the time has come for submitting to the people his proposed change in Britain's fiscal policy? By the equivocal course which he pursued on Thursday he justified the nickname of Mr. Facing-Both-Ways. He admitted that he had said that the sooner dissolution came the better. He was still, he asserted, of that opinion. Why, then, did he not advise his followers to vote for an amendment which would instantly have caused the result which he affected to desire?

We imagine that few of those who heard him view regard his professions as sincere, in view of the evasive position which he chose to take. He hoped, he said, that the Government would not abandon its trust simply because the Opposition wanted office. In other words, dissolution, while a good thing in itself, must not come as a concession to the demands of the Opposition. It must be voluntary on the Cabinet's part. That is to say, Premier BALFOUR, so far as Mr. CHAMBERLAIN is concerned, may retain power until near the close of this Parliament's statutory term, which does not end until the latter part of 1907.

This was a very different announcement from that which many of his devoted adherents must have looked for from Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They must have expected him to say that while he had the utmost respect and regard for the Prime Minister and was most reluctant to seem to countenance an unfriendly demonstration, yet he could not abjure the conviction, so frequently avowed, that the sooner the question of adopting his preferential tariff policy was referred to the constituencies the better would be its prospect of ultimate acceptance. If the vote be scrutinized by which the Asquith amendment was defeated—a vote of 311 to 245—it is evident that some of the more stalwart Chamberlainites resented their leader's inclination to "let I dare not wait upon I would," and refused to follow him into the Ministerial lobby.

The number of Unionist Free Traders cannot be exactly stated, because it has proved variable in the previous divisions that might have thrown light upon it. Never has it been computed, however, at less than 35. Now, as the Government majority against the Asquith amendment was only 63, this, it is obvious, would have been transformed into a minority had 32 Unionist Free Traders voted with the Opposition instead of supporting Mr. BALFOUR. Mr. ASQUITH and Sir HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN must have reckoned on assistance from that

quarter, and doubtless their reliance would have proved well founded but for the remarkable speech delivered by Lord HUGH CECIL, the leader of those Conservatives who adhere to the doctrine of Free Trade. To the chagrin of the Liberals Lord HUGH expressed the belief that the Free Trade cause would gain by keeping the present Government in office a while longer. From the long series of Free Trade triumphs in bygone elections he evidently drew the conclusion that the current of public opinion, already strong, would presently become a tidal wave. He would let it gather momentum, he said. As a matter of expediency, therefore, he should vote against the Asquith amendment, though in his judgment the amendment and fulfillment of the Premier's attitude on the fiscal question could not be exaggerated. In a word, he advised the Conservative Free Traders to reculer pour mieux sauter, to fall back the better to leap forward, and gave them the most positive assurance that he would pluck the pear when it was ripe.

It is manifest that the Balfour Government is left in a most precarious position. It will continue to exist on sufferance just so long as Mr. CHAMBERLAIN shall be disposed to make a half hearted and but partly effective attempt to restrain his followers and just so long as Lord HUGH CECIL shall deem it prudent to withhold his hand in order later to deal his cousin, the Premier, a deadly blow.

## Canada and the Hay-Bond Treaty.

Canada notes the demise of the over-ambitious Hay-Bond treaty with entire complacency. Her trade interests in the island rival those of the United States, and her political interest is more or less interwoven with her economic interests. Reciprocal trade relations between Newfoundland and the United States would be a stumbling block in the path of political union between the island and the Dominion.

The Toronto Globe admits that the defeat of the treaty will come as a great disappointment to the islanders. It says that "the American idea of reciprocity has been again shown to be to give nothing and take all." From this Canada reads a new lesson, and the Globe says that "the colonial statesman will never enter into a game of 'heads I win, tails you lose' with Uncle SAM, let him be never so smart. Reciprocity with the United States has ever been advanced in Newfoundland as a policy preferable to entering the Dominion. Consequently those Canadians who believe that the Ancient Colony can best fulfill its destiny by 'rounding off' confederation' will not greatly regret the result of the latest negotiations at Washington."

One consequence of the failure of the treaty is more than likely to appear in a stricter application of the Newfoundland bait act, by which American fishermen will be the losers. Another is likely to be witnessed in a diversion of trade to Canadian account in resentment of the American attitude.

Yet the Senate is right in standing for a full and free exercise of its treaty making powers as provided for in the Constitution.

## The Elimination of Sergius.

How far the evil influence in Russian affairs of the Grand Duke SERGIUS, who was assassinated yesterday, was justly attributable to him or whether he was merely a puppet in the hands of the bureaucracy, nobody, probably even in Russia, can say. In the popular mind he appeared as the instigator of the war with Japan, as the chief cause of the Czar's obstinacy in continuing it and as the person who stood above all in the way of concession to the recent petitions for greater freedom made by the zemstvos and the people.

To the hatred of tyranny was joined, in his case, loathing for the peacemaker who was plundering his country in the hour of danger. Public patriotic subscriptions, and even the money for the Red Cross work, were shown to have been diverted from their purpose and were believed to have gone, in part at least, into his pockets. While the Grand Duke VLADIMIR is hated as a cruel tyrant, SERGIUS was despised besides as a thief.

Will the assassination of one man or of a dozen men lighten the burden of Russia? It is very doubtful. Even if all the tribes of ROMANOFF were wiped out there stands back of them the bureaucracy. It was that which wrecked the Roman Empire and the Byzantine Empire and that is as surely wrecking the Orthodox Empire which in a way is its successor. It may be that the terror inspired by assassination may make it yield, but only revolution will remove it, and it may very well be that this present rebellion is revolution.

## A Strong and Virtuous Statesman.

The remarks interjected by the Hon. WILLIAM BUTLER CROCKRAN into the discussion in the House of Representatives of the Naval Appropriation bill are instinct with his usual knowledge and patriotism. What does a farm hand get? asks the Manhattan SOLON. Thirty dollars a month and hard, says the Hon. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH of Michigan. What does a fireman in the navy get? Sixteen dollars a month. "I do not think a really good man would enter the service in times of peace," observes Mr. CROCKRAN.

He is a good man himself and knows that a good man is "out" for what he can get. Compare the earnings of a good man in the navy with those of a good man who can milk trusts.

A long course in philanthropy has not kept Mr. CROCKRAN from drinking deep at the wells of American history:

"I was not aware that this country ever yet was humiliated since it joined the family of nations."

Probably not another man in the House could have shown so peculiar a knowledge of the early history of the United States. Mr. CROCKRAN is one of the men who make history.

Even if the common theory be true that the United States in the days of its weakness was kicked by foreign

Powers, what follows? Our ancestors were not virtuous. For,

"The strength and virtue of a man are the best defense of manhood always—not the size of the pistol in his pocket."

Unfortunately, nations cannot be as strong and virtuous as Mr. CROCKRAN. He can involve himself in his own virtue and not carry a "gun." Nobody, not even a trust, would dare to "hold" him "up"; but eighty millions of persons like him are impossible.

That is the reason why, in spite of him and his example, the United States must have a strong navy. We can't all be CROCKRANS. The per capita allowance of virtue and its rewards is too small.

When the price of your goods is too low, call in the United States.

How inconvenient it is for the sick to use one hand in flourishing the big stick over Venezuela while the other hand—the glad reavership hand—was benevolently extended to Santo Domingo!

Much stronger is the position of the Senate when asserting and protecting against invasion its own constitutional functions. It is recognized that the Asquith amendment, the constitutional rights and prerogatives of the House.

JAY COOKS did not live to see a banana belt girdling the northern tier of States, but he did live to see the Northern Pacific a great transcontinental highway, binding a new empire of Northwestern States to the Union of which they are part.

The proposed amendments to the insanity law that have been introduced in the Assembly by Mr. FINE are in line with the suggestions made by Governor HUGGINS in his message to the Legislature. They leave intact the existing centralized control of the finances of the State hospitals.

When the present insanity law was passed in the face of the opposition of the most important charitable societies in the State and against the advice of disinterested citizens who had an intelligent interest in the welfare of our State insane asylums one of the chief objections to it was the fact that it established boards of visitation without power in place of the old local boards of managers. Mr. FINE'S bill proposes to do away with the boards of visitation and to reestablish for each hospital a board of managers equipped with authority to appoint superintendents, subject to the approval of the Commission on Lunacy, and to establish regulations, subject to the same approval, for the internal administration of the hospital. The amendments also carry with them the recommendation that the local boards be composed of the representatives of the various churches, and that they be empowered to make effective the work of the proposed boards of managers.

These amendments are designed, evidently, to remedy the errors enacted during the recent unskillful tinkering with the lunacy laws; and they should be passed on their merits without opposition.

## Questions for Policemen.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Your editorial on the Equitable Life situation is interesting reading to policyholders in that company. May I request you to deal in your columns editorially with the following points:—The situation which are of vital interest to policyholders:

1. Should not the "Shipbuilding Trust directors" leave the board in any event?
2. How can the policyholders be assured that the directors are not known to be in the pocket of the Japanese?
3. Why are not boards of directors of mutual life insurance companies divided into yearly classes with a provision that no member of the outgoing class shall be eligible for reelection until the expiration of one year, with exceptions as to the president and one vice-president, who are the only officers who should be directors in mutual companies?

NEW YORK, Feb. 18.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Your editorial in to-day's issue, "Mr. Harriman and the Equitable Life," is a carefully written and conservative statement of the facts which will receive the hearty endorsement of all who have the welfare of the magnificent institution of life insurance truly at heart. I congratulate THE SUN on its position.

NEW YORK, Feb. 18.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Your editorial on the Equitable Life Assurance Society's internal war hit the nail exactly on the head and did a commendable service to the society's policyholders, of whom I am one. The idea of a marked increase in the purchase of \$100,000 or of any other sum in excess of the legal and moral value is repugnant to every honest and intelligent intellect.

L. E. P.  
 NEW YORK, Feb. 17.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—I have read with much interest the controversy that has just been settled in the Equitable Assurance company, involving a policyholder in that company. Mutualization is certainly the proper thing.

Incidentally, however, I would like to ask what means I have been for many years a policyholder in several of the other so-called "mutual" companies, and I have never yet been asked to attend a meeting, send a proxy or anything else showing I had any interest in the companies than to send a check for my premium when due.

Will the "mutualization" of the Equitable be of the same nature? POLICYHOLDER.  
 NEW YORK, Feb. 17.

## A Roman Catholic Priest on Church Drinking Clubs.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—In to-day's issue of THE SUN I see the Rev. John Reilly, Roman Catholic pastor, Brooklyn, is reported as having expressed his desire to establish club "in his church where the men could come and drink all they want." Does he really mean this?

All they want? If so, he may have a mix-up with the redoubtable Cardinal and archbishop the Ten Commandments and the police. Surely the reverend gentleman is not forgetful of the reprimand administered to him by the other so-called "mutual" companies, and I have never yet been asked to attend a meeting, send a proxy or anything else showing I had any interest in the companies than to send a check for my premium when due.

Will the "mutualization" of the Equitable be of the same nature? POLICYHOLDER.  
 NEW YORK, Feb. 17.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—I have a well informed friend who frequently assures me of the great superiority, in character and conduct, of Englishmen over Americans. Hereafter I have been told that the fact that my friend never has visited England. But a despatch in this morning's SUN tells us that Lord Grosvenor's hall the Duchess of Devonshire's residence was set on fire by a cigarette on the floor. That throws a flood of light upon the question. I never have been in an American ballroom where the gentlemen or ladies threw cigarettes and threw them upon the floor. But now, I suppose, the custom will be introduced here, and our ladies' tailors will soon advertise dropped cigarettes.

NEW YORK, Feb. 17.

Money Market of Maine.  
 From the Associated Republics.  
 Money is scarce here now. A pack of potatoes is the smallest change. These used to pass for a nickel, but they are only worth a postage stamp now and the mail carrier won't take them at that.

Standards.  
 First Egg—How do you suppose she let  
 Second Egg—She says she is soft-boiled, but every one knows she is scrambled.

## TREATY MAKING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—The Federal Constitution declares that "the executive power shall be vested in a President," who "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided they contain no article of emolument, privilege or honor, in respect of any office or person." That the judicial power shall extend to those treaties, and when made "under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

As "treaty" is the meaning of the word "treaties" in the year 1787, and thereabouts? "Treaty" is then, as now, a written definition by two or more separate States, of a specific relation actually subsisting between or among them, which definition they engage to accept and enforce as positive law.

Can there be a "treaty," entered into by the President and binding for the country, which is not the supreme law of the land and does not bind the legislative and judicial branches of the Government, and every citizen as well?

Unless empowered by a statute, or two-thirds of the Senators concur, what stipulations with a foreign State can the President make which will bind his country?

Has he any executive discretion to make by law act, unaided by Congress, or by two-thirds of the Senators present, any supreme law of the land or any compact with a foreign Government obligatory on the United States?

If a "treaty" is a written document, signed and executed with adequate formality, then should not the two-thirds of the Senate "concur" in each and every word and not merely give consent to the principles or outlines of a future negotiation?

Another article of the Constitution forbids any State to "enter into any agreement or compact with a foreign Power" without the consent of Congress, and another declares peremptorily that "no State shall enter into any treaty, alliance or confederation," but has the word "agreement" a different constitutional meaning from the word "treaty," as used in the articles referred to?

And was the word "agreement" employed by direction of the President, in the recent arbitration negotiations, in a sense unlike the accepted definition of the word "treaty"? Is it really worth while for the country to hold by the President why he used the word "agreement" instead of "treaty," and why he fancied the two words are not synonymous in a constitutional sense?

The making of a treaty, or an agreement which is to bind the will and the property of any citizen of the United States, is a very serious transaction, as serious as the enacting of a statute. Its language must be considered carefully by all the persons who are, under the Constitution, to consent to the document in behalf of the United States.

They must all concur in every word.  
 NEW YORK, Feb. 17.

## Things Japanese.

Japan's exports for November, 1904, were \$17,220,000, against \$13,800,000 in November, 1903, an increase of \$3,420,000, and her imports were \$18,800,000, or a total foreign commerce increase of \$4,600,000. The increase in the value of her exports for the eleven months ended November last was \$35,000,000. This result is surprising.

Baron Sone, the distinguished Japanese statesman now in London, recently said at a meeting of the Central Asian Society: "When this war ends Japan will devote herself to the study of peace, and in what form the present conflict may terminate."

During the past four months the entire Japanese fleet has been at anchor, cleaned and repaired. The heavy guns of British manufacture suffered less from the severe use made of them than any others, their firing having been severely at all times. To the fleet the first is in better condition than when the war began.

In Japan, drawing—not necessarily art—is an essential subject of the Japanese code of education, and is taught in all the State schools. In the higher schools it is compulsory. So far it is not as satisfactorily taught as it should be, because the artist in Japan, as a man, is still considered of inferior rank to his best point is the student of plant forms, birds, fishes and insects. Japan is the only country that has a national and distinctive art of its own, but it is in danger of dilution by a mixture of Oriental ideas.

Baron Sone, the Japanese Minister of Finance, is in favor of granting the right of ownership of Japanese lands to foreigners. In the higher schools it is compulsory. So far it is not as satisfactorily taught as it should be, because the artist in Japan, as a man, is still considered of inferior rank to his best point is the student of plant forms, birds, fishes and insects. Japan is the only country that has a national and distinctive art of its own, but it is in danger of dilution by a mixture of Oriental ideas.

Mr. D. V. Brown, general trade agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, says that Germany's fuss about the "yellow peril" is all nonsense, that the war has caused a marked increase in many lines of Chinese trade, that it has opened up new markets of extremely valuable country, under the Chinese system of government, would have been closed to trade for many years except for Japan's action.

During January, while Russia was moving heaven and earth to secure a solitary torpedo boat, the Japanese Admiralty completed twenty-four torpedo boat destroyers in the various yards, Government and private, in Japan.

In 1904 Japan was using only 100,000 kilowatts of electricity in the central stations. Ten years later it was 12,500 kilowatts, while last year the amount of electricity generated was 20,725 kilowatts, according to the report of the Japanese Association of Electrical Engineers. This association maintains a permanent exhibition of electrical apparatus in Tokyo.

Japan's import of sole leather averaged \$300,000 a year for 1902-03 fiscal years for the first half of the present fiscal year it was \$277,750, nearly 100 per cent. increase, chiefly from the United States. The bulk of the increase was accounted for by the import of Japanese sole leather, which was \$100,000, an increase of \$100,000.

Japan has 48 telephone exchanges, with 36,700 subscribers. One line—Tokyo to Saitama—is 900 miles long. Japan bought of us \$21,596,000 worth of goods in 1904 calendar year, an increase of \$10,000,000, over her import of Japan \$49,758,000 worth, an increase of \$1,000,000.

Mr. McCall's Speech.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—As a manufacturer I wish to thank you very much for your publication of the extract from the Congressional Record of Mr. McCall's speech. What rates are in place of much importance, so long as they are equally just as between localities and grades of merchandise, but that one shipper should be in a position to obtain one rate and another shipper be forced to pay a higher rate, renders the public generally in an outrageous frame of mind toward the railway companies, and they themselves in this respect are their own worst enemies. What the Congress may bring upon the railway companies will be due to their own folly.

HENRY B. JOY,  
 General Manager Piquette Motor Car Company,  
 DETROIT, Mich., Feb. 14.

The Backbone.

From the Northern Leader.  
 When asked by her teacher to describe the backbone, a Northern school girl said: "The backbone is something that holds up the head and ribs and keeps one from having legs stick out to the side."

Personally Conducted.  
 Noah called to his wife.  
 "My dear," he grunted, "you remember Dr. Hightower advised you to take a European trip? I'm exactly underneath."

Fasting himself for an indulgent husband, he went blind.

## ADDICKS LOSES SEVEN VOTES.

Cannot Now Control a Majority of the Republicans in the Legislature.

DOVER, Del., Feb. 17.—J. Edward Addicks lost seven of his Union Republican supporters to-day, and as a result loses his majority in the Republican delegation in this Legislature. His Republican opponents may now call a caucus at any time and have within their reach a majority against him to bring about his undoing. The Addicks dissenters broke away from the once powerful leader on the ground that he can never be elected Senator and that they are opposed to the deadlock system.

When Senator A. S. Lingo, the first Addicks man to turn, arose to vote, there was a hush. He pronounced the name of "T. Coleman DuPont," and instantly there was a burst of applause, led by Major Edmund Mitchell, Regular Republican of Wilmington. Last Senator Lingo will voted deliberately for T. Coleman DuPont, but there was too much of a stir to start any more demonstrations. The break, which many people, particularly Addicks men, doubted and declared to be mere idle gossip, had come, and that was enough.

The vote, when tallied, stood as follows: Willard Salisbury, Democrat, 20; John Edward Addicks, Union Republican, 15; Henry A. DuPont, Regular Republican, 9; T. Coleman DuPont, Regular Republican, 4; Caleb R. Layton, Union Republican, 1; Harry A. Richardson, Regular Republican, 1. Total, 50; necessary to elect, 26.

Senator Rose, Democrat, then rushed through a motion to separate the two houses, and further developments for the day and week were checked, as to-morrow's will be only a perfunctory session.

President Conner, the Addicks stalwart leader, when asked for his opinion of the break and of the changed situation, said: "Well, you can say that there are twelve of us who are determined to stand for our caucus nominee."

"But how about your claim of majority rule?"

"Well, we've held our caucus, and one's enough. That's all."

Had the balloting continued to-day a Senator would have been elected, but the Democratic opposition checked matters until Monday.

## ONLY THREE LEPERS HERE.

They Are on Blackwell's Island—Disease Not a Public Danger in New York.

Dr. Charles F. Roberts, the leprosy expert of the Health Department, denied yesterday the allegation made by Dr. Isidore Dyer, consulting expert of the Louisiana leprosy camp, that there were 200 lepers walking about New York and that they were a grave danger to the city.

Dr. Roberts said that leprosy was a chronic, feebly infectious disease, far less dangerous than tuberculosis and some other diseases that are common. He said that persons might associate with lepers for years and not contract the disease, and many cases were known where leprosy wives had lived with non-leprosy husbands, or vice versa, and the non-leprosy party had never contracted the disease.

"The present day fear of leprosy," said the doctor, "comes entirely from Holy Writ. There the leper is always called unclean and stoned and cast out from his fellows. But modern science does not show anything about the disease to cause such terror."

Some years ago, the doctor said, the city had segregated five lepers on North Brother Island. On his own recommendation they were released, and he knows of no others. They are public charges on Blackwell's Island.

In all his experience, Dr. Roberts said, he had never seen a case of leprosy contracted in this country. All the cases he had knowledge of came here from other places.

In 1890 the Medical Society appointed the following committee to investigate the disease: Drs. George H. Fox,